

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. Claims 2, 11, and 20 were canceled; claims 1, 10, and 19 were amended. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

I. Examiner Interview

Applicants greatly appreciate the courtesies extended by the Examiner during the interviews that were conducted on May 9-10 and 14, 2007. Applicants' claims were discussed.

The Examiner stated that the claims would be allowed provided they were amended as discussed. Applicants have made every effort to amend the claims in accordance with these discussions. In the event the Examiner finds that further amendments are necessary, Applicants would be pleased to discuss these with the Examiner.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, which applicants regard as the invention.

The independent claims are claims 1, 10, and 19.

Claims 1, 10, and 19 have been amended to recite: "said pulses comprising first pulses that represent logical ones and second pulses that represent logical zeros, said first pulses having a first width and said second pulses having a second width. An example of support for this amendment can be found in the specification on page 7, lines 6-10 and 16-20.

Prior to this amendment, the claims described indicating logical ones using first pulses, and indicating logical zeros using second pulses. The claims also described first pulses that are a first width, and second pulses that are a second width. Since the features of Applicants' amended claims appeared in the previously presented claims, Applicants have not changed the scope of the claims.

The Examiner states:

In claim 1, it is unclear what is meant by "indicating logic ones using first pulses that are a first width.. . and indicating logic zeros.. ." and what device is used for performing this step.

In claims 10 and 19, it is unclear which device is used for "indicating" logic ones or logical zero.

In claims 3 and 5, it is unclear how the step of "generating said first and second pulses.. ." are interrelated and associated with the step of indicating logical ones.. . and indicating logical zeros.. ." as recited in claim 1.

In claim 6, it is unclear how the step of "generating said first pulses.. ." and the step of "generating second pulses.. ." are interrelated and associated with the step of indicating logical ones.. . and indicating logical zeros.. ." as recited in claim 1. **In claim 12**, it is unclear how "first and second pulses being generated using an external device" is interrelated and associated with the logical ones being indicated . . . and logical zeros being indicated . . ." as recited in claim 10. **In claim 15**, it is unclear how "first pulses generated by closing said switch for a first length of time" and "second pulses generated by closing said switch for a second length of time" are interrelated and associated with "logic ones being indicated using first pulses that are a first width and logical zeros being indicated using second pulses that are a second width" as recited in claim 10. **In claim 18**, it is unclear how "first and second pulses being generated using an external device" is interrelated and associated with the logical ones being indicated . . . and logical zeros being indicated . . ." as recited in claim 10. **In claim 20**, it is unclear how "instructions for generating said first pulses.. ." and "instructions for generating second pulses.. ." are interrelated and associated with "instruction for indicating logical ones.. . a second length" as recited in claim 10. The dependent claims not specifically address share the same indefiniteness as they depend from rejected base claims.

Final Office Action, mailed April 12, 2007, pages 2-3.

Applicants have canceled "indicating logical ones using first pulses that are a first width and indicating logical zeros using second pulses that are a second width" from claim 1, canceled "logical ones being indicated using first pulses that are a first width and logical zeros being indicated using second pulses that are a second width" from claim 10, and canceled "instructions for indicating logical ones using first pulses that are a first width and indicating logical zeros using second pulses that are a second width" from claim 19. Therefore, Applicants believe the rejection of claims 1, 10, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, has been overcome, and should be withdrawn.

Regarding claims 3, 5-6, 12, 15, 18, and 20, since claims 1, 10, and 19 have been amended to delete the "indicating" language from the claims, Applicants believe claims 3, 5-6, 12, 15, 18, and 20 are no longer indefinite.

Applicants believe the rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite has been overcome by the amendments to the claims, and should be withdrawn.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 8-10, 12 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by *Frankowsky, On Chip Programmable Data Pattern Generator for Semiconductor Memories*, U.S. Patent No. 6, 651,203, dated November 18, 2003 (hereinafter referred to as "*Frankowsky*").

The Examiner has not rejected claims 2, 11, or 20 under either 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated or 35 U.S.C. 103. as being unpatentable. Therefore, Applicants believe claims 2, 11, and 20 include allowable subject matter.

Applicants have incorporated the features of claim 2 into claim 1, incorporated the features of claim 11 into claim 10; and incorporated the features of claim 20 into claim 19. As a result, Applicants believe claims 1, 10, and 19 are now allowable. Therefore, the rejection of claims 1, 10, and 19 as being anticipated by *Frankowsky* has been overcome, and should be withdrawn.

The remaining claims depend from the independent claims discussed above and are patentable for the reasons given above.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 10, and 19, and cancelled claims 2, 11, and 20 from further consideration in this application. Applicants are not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the allowable subject matter noted by the examiner. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.”

IV. 35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness

The Examiner rejected claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Prysky et al., Method and Apparatus for Compensating Input Threshold Variations on Input Buffers*, U.S. Patent No. 6,191,926, dated February 20, 2001 (hereinafter referred to as "*Prysky*") in view of *Kim et al., Apparatus and Method for Driving Image Display Device*, U.S. patent No. 6,977,634, dated December 20, 2005 (hereinafter referred to as "*Kim*").

Although the Examiner did not note the specific claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner discussed claims 1, 3, 10, 12, and 19 in the body of the rejection. Therefore, Applicants believe only claims 1, 3, 10, 12, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

As discussed above, the Examiner has not rejected claims 2, 11, or 20 under either 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated or 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable. Since amended claims 1, 10, and 19 include the features of claims 2, 11, and 20, respectively, Applicants believe amended claims 1, 10, and 19 are allowable. The remaining claims depend from the independent claims discussed above and are patentable for the reasons given above.

Therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome, and should be withdrawn.

V. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is now in condition for allowance.

The examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: May 15, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Lisa L.B. Yociss/

Lisa L.B. Yociss
Reg. No. 36,975
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorney for Applicants